

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/808,200	03/13/2001	Stephen H. Pettigrew	PET1P001A	4219
28875	7590 04/22/2003			
SILICON VALLEY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 72 SAN JOSE, C	OX 721120 OSE, CA 95172-1120		HUNTER, ALVIN A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3711	16
			DATE MAILED: 04/22/2003	17

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	09/808,200	PETTIGREW ET AL.			
	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Alvin A. Hunter	3711			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 14 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application in the same of this application applicati	cation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later th ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:				
(a) ☑ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	tion(s):				
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely filed amendment			
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: 21-26, 30-35, and 38.					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disap	proved by the Examiner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. Other:					
	Sup	Paul T. Seweil ervisory Patent Examiné r Group 3700			
I.S. Patent and Trademark Office		•			

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that the usage of the Johnson reference in place of the OFFICIAL NOTICE taken October 24, 2002 is not analogous. The examiner respectfully disagrees. "I order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an applicant's invention, the reference must either being in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concern." In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446. Johnson is analogous because it deals with the problem of how to teach the user to improve their play --by using text to indicate what the user should do. The applicant uses text to tell the user where to hit the ball, improving their play. One having ordinary skill in the art would have clearly found it obvious to use text to teach the user how to improve his/her golf game. The applicant cited 2141(a) in which the above is disclosed.